



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,709	06/27/2000	Frederick J. Damerau	YOR9-2000-0324US1	3738

30743 7590 03/29/2004

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

AZAD, ABUL K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

11

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/605,709

Applicant(s)

DAMERAU ET AL.

Examiner

ABUL K. AZAD

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on December 12, 2003, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. Non-final Office Action set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

2. Claims 1-6 are pending in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarukkai et al. (US 5,819,220).

Art Unit: 2654

As per claim 1, Sarukkai teaches, "an automated method for setting up an a natural language interface in a Web site (col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 7, particularly reads on "in the context of speech interfaces to the web, the invention dynamically makes use of information provided by links in a document or the current page of the source document being viewed") comprising the steps of":

"defining a hierarchy of topics into which individual documents or Web pages can be classified" (col. 7, lines 17-60, reads on Table 1, here links are defining a hierarchy of topics);

"generating a keyword index for those documents" (col. 7, lines 17-60, reads on "the information shown in the table was extracted automatically by a simple parsing JAVA program shown in Appendix 1. The set of words constituting the link referent can constitute a web triggered word set, and it would make sense to base the speech recognition search towards this set of words since it is likely that the user will utter them); and

"for each topic in the hierarchy, a set of n-grams to a topic in the topic hierarchy, which set of n-grams is distinctive to the topic and wherein the n-grams maybe sparse or non-sparse n-grams" (col. 9, lines 17-24; and col. 10, lines 16-24; particularly reads on "the concept of extracting web-triggered word set information depending on the context of the web pages recently viewed can also be implemented in other methods. One method would be to appropriately smooth/re-estimate n-gram language model scores using HTML sources of the documents recently viewed").

Art Unit: 2654

As per claim 2 Sarukkai teaches, "wherein the step of generating a keyword index comprises the step of extracting sparse n-grams of keywords for each group of pages in the topic hierarchy" (col. 9, lines 19-22, and col. 10, lines 16-24; reads on "n-gram language model score using the HTML sources of the documents recently viewed").

As per claim 3, Sarukkai teaches, "further comprising the step of optionally reviewing and editing the keyword index" (col. 6, lines 36-39, reads on "modify the appropriate language Model and/or acoustic model parameters dynamically in step 34, using the selected word-set list (step 32), to be used during the speech recognition search process").

As per claim 4, Sarukkai teaches, "an automated method for setting up an instance of natural language interface in a web site (col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 7, particularly reads on "in the context of speech interfaces to the web, the invention dynamically makes use of information provided by links in a document or the current page of the source document being viewed") comprising the steps of:"

"automatically inducing a topic hierarchy by examining a structure of the Web site" (col. 7, lines 17-60, reads on Table 1, here links are defining a hierarchy of topics);

"creating rules from the n-grams, wherein each topic has associated rules that are used to decide if a new input document or query references the topic" (col. 7, lines 17-60, reads on "the information shown in the table was extracted automatically by a

Art Unit: 2654

simple parsing JAVA program shown in Appendix 1. The set of words constituting the link referent can constitute a web triggered word set, and it would make sense to base the speech recognition search towards this set of words since it is likely that the user will utter them" and col. 8, lines 54-67).

"creating rules from the n-grams, wherein each topic has associated rules that are used to decide if a new input document or query references the topic; creating n-grams from pages in the Website that are associated with a topic in the topic hierarchy wherein the n-grams may be sparse n-grams or non-sparse n-grams" (col. 9, lines 17-23 and col. 10, lines 10-24).

As per claim 5, Sarukkai teaches, "wherein the step of creating rules for a classification engine is performed automatically and further comprising the optional step of manually editing the rules" (col. 10, lines 10-15, particularly reads on "building grammars dynamically involves a lot of computation overhead. The web-trigger approach does not dynamically vary the vocabularies. The web triggered word set boosting just selectively alters the scores that are assigned to the different words, treating the web triggered word sets differently").

As per claim 6, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Art Unit: 2654

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Abul K. Azad** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3838**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richemond Dorvil**, can be reached at **(703) 305-9645**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

(For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center's Customer Service Office at telephone number **(703) 306-0377**.

Abul K. Azad

March 12, 2004


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER